Two distinct superconducting states in KFe_2As_2 under high pressure

Taichi Terashima,[1] Kunihiro Kihou,[2] Kaori Sugii,[1] Naoki Kikugawa,[1] Takehiko Matsumoto,[1] Shigeyuki Ishida,[2] Chul-Ho Lee,[2] Akira Iyo,[2] Hiroshi Eisaki,[2] and Shinya Uji[1]

[1] *National Institute for Materials Science, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0003, Japan*
[2] *National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8568, Japan*

(Dated: May 1, 2014)

We report measurements of ac magnetic susceptibility χ_{ac} and de Haas-van Alphen (dHvA) oscillations in KFe_2As_2 under high pressure up to 24.7 kbar. The pressure dependence of the superconducting transition temperature T_c changes from negative to positive across $P_c \sim 18$ kbar as previously reported. The ratio of the upper critical field to T_c, i.e, B_{c2}/T_c, is enhanced above P_c, and the shape of χ_{ac} vs field curves qualitatively changes across P_c. DHvA oscillations smoothly evolve across P_c, indicating no drastic change in the Fermi surface up to 24.7 kbar. Three dimensionality increases with pressure, while effective masses show decreasing trends. We suggest a crossover from a nodal to a full-gap s wave as a possible explanation.

PACS numbers: 74.70.Xa, 74.62.Fj, 71.18.+y, 74.25.Dw, 74.25.Jb

arXiv:1401.6257v3 [cond-mat.supr-con] 30 Apr 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the discovery of superconductivity at $T_c = 26$ K in LaFeAs(O, F) by Kamihara *et al.*,[1] iron-based high-T_c superconductivity has been one of the focuses of research in the condensed-matter physics community. One of notable features of the iron-based superconductors is that, unlike the cuprates, their gap structures are not universal: while some are fully gapped, others have nodal gap structures.[2] Especially intriguing is the case of $(Ba_{1-x}K_x)Fe_2As_2$: thermodynamic and other measurements indicate that the gap structure changes from a fully gapped one near the optimal doping ($x \sim 0.4$)[3–7] to a nodal one at $x = 1$, i.e, KFe_2As_2.[8–13] A laser ARPES (angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy) study on KFe_2As_2 has found an s-wave gap with accidental nodes on one of the Γ-centered Fermi surface cylinders,[12] although there is a claim of a d-wave gap based on thermal conductivity measurements.[11] Theoretical studies based on spin-fluctuations approaches indicate that various gap structures with s- or d-wave symmetries are in close competition.[14–17]

Recently, Tafti *et al.* have found from resistivity measurements that the pressure dependence of T_c in KFe_2As_2 changes from negative to positive at a critical pressure $P_c = 17.5$ kbar.[18] Since the resistivity and Hall coefficient vary smoothly across P_c, it has been claimed that this change is not due to a change in the Fermi surface but due to a change of pairing symmetry. In this paper, our ac magnetic susceptibility χ_{ac} measurements confirm that the pressure dependence of bulk T_c in KFe_2As_2 does change at P_c. We show that the ratio B_{c2}/T_c, where B_{c2} is the upper critical field for $B \parallel c$, is enhanced above P_c and that magnetic responses in the superconducting states below and above P_c are markedly different. We also show that de Haas-van Alphen (dHvA) oscillations vary smoothly across P_c, suggesting absence of Fermi surface (FS) reconstruction at P_c in line with Ref. 18. We discuss implications of these observations.

II. EXPERIMENT

High-quality single crystals of KFe_2As_2 were prepared by a self-flux method.[19] A sample placed in a balanced pick-up coil was pressurized in a NiCrAl piston-cylinder pressure cell, which was loaded in a ^{3}He-^{4}He dilution refrigerator equipped with a 20 T superconducting magnet. The pressure transmitting media was Daphne 7474, which remains liquid up to 37 kbar at room temperature and ensures highly hydrostatic pressure generation.[20] A Manganin wire gauge was used to determine the pressure at low temperatures.[21]

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 1(a) shows χ_{ac} as a function of temperature T for pressures up to 24.7 kbar. The superconducting transition shits to lower temperatures up to 16.4 kbar ($< P_c$) but moves to higher temperatures as the pressure is increased from 21.4 ($> P_c$) to 24.7 kbar. The size of the diamagnetic signal does not change with P, indicating that the superconducting volume fraction does not change with P. Figure 1(b) shows χ_{ac} as a function of magnetic field B for pressures up to 24.7 kbar. The upper critical field B_{c2} decreases with P for $P < P_c$ but increases for $P > P_c$ similarly to T_c. Figure 1(c) shows T_c, B_{c2}, and B_{c2}/T_c as a function of pressure.[22] Although the present values of T_c for $P > P_c$ are slightly lower than those reported in Ref. 18, the variation of T_c qualitatively agrees with Ref. 18 and also with a most recent article.[23] Low-pressure data are also consistent with Ref. 24. A new observation here is that the ratio B_{c2}/T_c grows across P_c: it decreases with P up to 16.4 kbar but takes a larger value at 21.4 kbar. We also notice that the $\chi_{ac}(B)$ curves change qualitatively across P_c [Fig. 1(b)]. At $P = 0$ kbar, χ_{ac} shows a rounded downward peak just below B_{c2}. This is due to the peak effect.[25] Figure 1(b) shows that the peak effect becomes smaller and smaller



FIG. 1. (color online). (a) AC magnetic susceptibility χ_{ac} as a function of T at different pressures. (b) χ_{ac} as a function of the field B applied parallel to the c axis at different pressures. The curves for $P = 21.4$ and 24.7 kbar are shifted vertically. The measurement temperature is $0.02T_c$ or lower at each pressure. (c) Pressure dependencies of T_c, B_{c2}, and B_{c2}/T_c. The definitions of T_c and B_{c2} are shown in (a) and (b), respectively.

as the pressure is increased up to 16.4 kbar. However, as the pressure is further increased to 21.4 kbar ($> P_c$), the peak effect strengthens abruptly. The shape of the peak is also different: a shoulder appears on the lower field side of the peak above P_c. The clear difference of response of



FIG. 2. (color online). Fermi surface cross-sections observed via dHvA measurements at ambient pressure. The in-plane anisotropy is neglected. The line thickness indicates the magnitude of the c-axis dispersion. Reproduced from Ref. 26

the vortex lattice to the applied field between below and above P_c as well as the increase in B_{c2}/T_c above P_c indicates that there are two distinct superconducting states below and above P_c.

Before describing dHvA data under high pressure, we review the Fermi surface in KFe_2As_2 at ambient pressure. As schematically shown in Fig. 2, the Fermi surface consists of three hole cylinders α, ζ, and β at the Γ point of the Brillouin zone (BZ) and small hole cylinders ϵ near the X point.[26–29] Each cylinder has the minimum and maximum orbits giving rise to two dHvA frequencies labeled with subscripts l and h hereafter, except that only one frequency has been found for the β cylinder.[26] The α_l and ζ_l orbits are close enough for magnetic breakdown to occur at certain points of the orbits. See the $P = 0$ kbar spectrum in Fig. 4(a): small peaks except α_h between the α_l and ζ_l peaks are magnetic breakdown frequencies and their amplitudes are quickly suppressed as field is decreased.[26]

DHvA oscillations have been observed at all the measured pressures. For example, Fig. 3(a) shows Fourier transforms of dHvA oscillations in two field windows measured at $P = 21.4$ kbar. Part of the oscillations is shown in the inset. Two frequency peaks below $F \lesssim 0.3$ kT are identified as the ϵ_l and ϵ_h frequencies. Among many peaks appearing in a frequency region between 2.5 and 3 kT, two peaks that retain substantial amplitudes in the low-field spectrum (dotted line) are identified as the α_l and α_h fundamental frequencies. The rest can be ascribed to magnetic breakdown frequencies between α_l and ζ_l, although it is difficult to identify the latter. Figure 3(b) shows the temperature dependences of the amplitudes of α_l and α_h. By fitting the Lifshitz-Kosevich formula[30] to them, we obtain effective masses of 4.6(3) and 5.5(5) m_e, respectively, where m_e is the free electron mass.

Figure 4(a) shows the Fourier spectra for all the measured pressures. The $\epsilon_{l,h}$ frequencies decrease with pressure, while the $\alpha_{l,h}$ frequencies increase. The frequencies of ϵ_l, ϵ_h, α_l, and α_h at $P = 24.7$ kbar are 68, 84, 111, and 114% of those at $P = 0$ kbar. Since the lattice is compressed by pressure, the Brillouin zone expands with



FIG. 3. (color online). (a) Fourier transforms of dHvA oscillations at $P = 21.4$ kbar in two different field windows. The two large peaks in the low-field spectrum (dotted) are identified as the $\alpha_{l,h}$ fundamental frequencies. The inset shows part of the recorded oscillations. (b) Temperature dependences of the amplitudes of the $\alpha_{l,h}$ frequencies. Solid lines are fits to the Lifshitz-Kosevich formula, from which the effective masses are estimated as indicated.

pressure and hence dHvA frequencies would increase even without change in the electronic structure. Although there is no high-pressure structural data on KFe_2As_2, a neutron study on $BaFe_2As_2$ shows that the a axis shrinks by about 1% at $P = 25$ kbar,[31] corresponding to 2 % expansion of the Brillouin zone. The observed changes are larger than this and are opposite in the cases of the $\epsilon_{l,h}$ frequencies.

We first consider the possibility of a Lifshitz transition at P_c. It seems that the Γ-centered cylinders are too big to disappear and too small to touch the Brillouin zone boundary by the application of a moderate pressure of 25 kbar (see Fig. 2), and indeed the α frequencies continue to exist above P_c. The only possibility to be seriously considered is disappearance or fragmentation of the ϵ cylinder. However, Fig. 4(a) clearly shows that the ϵ cylinder continues to exist above P_c. We therefore conclude that no Lifshitz transition occurs at P_c in line with Ref. 18. The pressure variation of the $\epsilon_{l,h}$ frequencies is smooth across P_c. If we extrapolate it to higher pressures, we can expect that the cylinder will be divided at the position of the minimum cross-section, i.e., $F_{\epsilon_l} \to 0$, near 70 kbar. It would be interesting to see what happens there.

We now turn to the global structure of the Fermi sur-



FIG. 4. (color online). (a) Fourier transforms of dHvA oscillations at different pressures. For $P = 16.4$, 21.4, and 24.7 kbar, high-field (solid) and low-field (dotted) transforms are shown as in Fig. 3(a) to identify the $\alpha_{l,h}$ fundamental frequencies. (b) Pressure dependencies of the effective masses associated with the $\alpha_{l,h}$ fundamental frequencies. In both (a) and (b), the data for $P = 0$ kbar are taken from Ref. 26.

face above P_c. At ambient pressure, the ϵ, α, ζ, and β cylinders have been estimated from the dHvA frequencies to occupy 1.1×4, 8.4, 13.0, and 25.6% of the Brillouin zone (% BZ) respectively (there are four ϵ cylinders per the Brillouin zone).[26] The present dHvA data at P = 24.7 kbar indicate that the ϵ and α cylinders occupy 0.8×4 and 9.2% BZ, respectively, where we have used the average of the minimum and maximum frequencies and have taken into account the 2% expansion of the Brillouin zone cross-section. As explained above, magnetic breakdown frequencies between α_l and ζ_l are observed above P_c [Fig. 4(a)]. It indicates that the sizes of the two cylinders stay close above P_c, and hence we can assume that the ζ cylinder grows by about 1% BZ from P = 0 to 24.7 kbar as α does. To conserve the total Fermi surface volume, the β cylinder would shrink by about 1% BZ at P = 24.7 kbar. These estimates indicate that the global structure of the Fermi surface hardly changes up to P = 24.7 kbar ($> P_c$).

Nonetheless, there are noteworthy changes in the electronic structure. Firstly, the three-dimensionality grows with pressure as expected. To quantify it, $\Delta F/F_{av}$ increases from 0.40 to 0.59 for the ϵ cylinder and from 0.038 to 0.069 for the α cylinder as the pressure is increased up to P = 24.7 kbar, where ΔF and F_{av} are the difference and the average of the minimum and maximum frequencies. Secondly, there is a decreasing trend in effective masses. Fig. 4(b) shows the effective masses of $\alpha_{l,h}$ as a function of pressure. Although error bars are large, a general decreasing trend can be seen both below and above P_c. The effective mass m^* can be expressed as $m^* = m_{band}(1+\lambda)$, m_{band} being the band mass. The mass enhancement $(1+\lambda)$ is due to interactions between electrons and bosons such as phonons and spin fluctuations. Since changes in the sizes of the Fermi surface cylinders are not appreciable up to P = 24.7 kbar as noted above, we may assume m_{band} to be constant. Then, the decreasing trend in m^* translates into that in λ.

We now discuss implications of our results. The increasing three-dimensionality and decreasing λ are generally considered unfavorable to superconductivity, and hence seem at odds with the increasing T_c above P_c. Let us consider a McMillan-type formula $T_c \sim T_o \exp[-(1+\lambda)/\lambda]$. The characteristic boson energy T_o here is the spin-fluctuation energy T_{SF}, which is roughly inversely proportional to γ and hence to $(1+\lambda)$, where γ is the electronic specific heat coefficient.[32] The above formula then produces a broad maximum of T_c as the coupling strength λ is varied but not a minimum as observed. Even with more elaborated treatments of spin-fluctuation mediated superconductivity such as Refs. 32 and 33, it would be difficult to reconcile the minimum of T_c at P_c with the decreasing λ within a single-band picture. The reversal of the pressure dependence of T_c is therefore related to the multiband nature of the superconductivity in KFe_2As_2. Namely, it is caused by competition among different intraband and interband pair scatterings.

Finally, we consider whether P_c is a phase transition or crossover ? The $T_c(P)$ curve reported in Ref. 18 has a sharp V-shaped minimum at P_c. Since the authors take the view of a d-wave symmetry at ambient pressure, they have suggested a phase transition from a d wave to an s wave at P_c. In comparison, the anomaly at P_c in our $T_c(P)$ data appears rather weak and gradual. Also, the laser ARPES study has provided strong evidence that the gap structure at ambient pressure is an s-wave one with accidental nodes, and results of a magnetic-field-angle dependent specific heat study are compatible with it.[12,13] We therefore suggest another possibility that the minimum of T_c at P_c may be due to a crossover from a nodal s wave to a full-gap s wave. Since the symmetry remains an s wave, it is not a phase transition.[2] Existence of nodes on the Fermi surface is basically unfavorable to T_c because part of strong pair scattering contributes destructively to pairing.[34] Thus removal of nodes may result in enhancement of T_c. We here pay spacial attention to a recent theoretical work.[17] It successfully predicts a gap structure that is compatible with the laser ARPES data, using interaction parameters estimated from band structure calculations. The predicted gap structure is an s-wave one in which the gap function basically changes sign between the two Γ-centered hole pockets in the unfolded zone, which correspond to our α and ζ cylinders, and has nodes on one of the pockets corresponding to our ζ cylinder. More importantly, it also shows that if the intraband scattering within the α cylinder is only slightly weakened, the nodes are readily removed.

IV. SUMMARY

We have confirmed from bulk T_c measurements that the pressure dependence of T_c in KFe_2As_2 changes sign at P_c. The ratio B_{c2}/T_c is enhanced above P_c, and magnetic responses of the vortex lattice show qualitative changes across P_c. These suggest two different superconducting states below and above P_c. On the other hand, our dHvA data have shown no drastic change across P_c. The global structure of the Fermi surface hardly changes up to the highest pressure of 24.7 kbar, and no Lifshitz transition occurs at P_c. Only changes that we have observed are the increasing three-dimensionality and the decreasing trend in the effective mass. They are generally unfavorable to superconductivity within a single-band picture. We have argued that the reversal of the pressure dependence of T_c is related to competition between different pair scattering processes and have proposed that it may be explained by crossover from a nodal to a full-gap s wave superconductivity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Hiroaki Ikeda and Kazuhiko Kuroki for valuable discussions.

[1] Y. Kamihara, T. Watanabe, M. Hirano, and H. Hosono, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **130**, 3296 (2008).

[2] See. for a review, P. J. Hirschfeld, M. M. Korshunov, and I. I. Mazin, Rep. Prog. Phys. **74**, 124508 (2011).

[3] K. Hashimoto, T. Shibauchi, S. Kasahara, K. Ikada, S. Tonegawa, T. Kato, R. Okazaki, C. J. van der Beek, M. Konczykowski, H. Takeya, K. Hirata, T. Terashima, and Y. Matsuda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 207001 (2009).

[4] G. Mu, H. Luo, Z. Wang, L. Shan, C. Ren, and H.-H. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 174501 (2009).

[5] P. Popovich, A. V. Boris, O. V. Dolgov, A. A. Golubov, D. L. Sun, C. T. Lin, R. K. Kremer, and B. Keimer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 027003 (2010).

[6] X. G. Luo, M. A. Tanatar, J.-P. Reid, H. Shakeripour, N. Doiron-Leyraud, N. Ni, S. L. Bud'ko, P. C. Canfield, H. Luo, Z. Wang, H.-H. Wen, R. Prozorov, and L. Taillefer, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 140503 (2009).

[7] M. Yashima, H. Nishimura, H. Mukuda, Y. Kitaoka, K. Miyazawa, P. M. Shirage, K. Kihou, H. Kito, H. Eisaki, and A. Iyo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **78**, 103702 (2009).

[8] H. Fukazawa, Y. Yamada, K. Kondo, T. Saito, Y. Kohori, K. Kuga, Y. Matsumoto, S. Nakatsuji, H. Kito, P. M. Shirage, K. Kihou, N. Takeshita, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, and H. Eisaki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **78**, 083712 (2009).

[9] K. Hashimoto, A. Serafin, S. Tonegawa, R. Katsumata, R. Okazaki, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, H. Ikeda, Y. Matsuda, A. Carrington, and T. Shibauchi, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 014526 (2010).

[10] J. K. Dong, S. Y. Zhou, T. Y. Guan, H. Zhang, Y. F. Dai, X. Qiu, X. F. Wang, Y. He, X. H. Chen, and S. Y. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 087005 (2010).

[11] J.-P. Reid, M. A. Tanatar, A. Juneau-Fecteau, R. T. Gordon, S. R. de Cotret, N. Doiron-Leyraud, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, R. Prozorov, and L. Taillefer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 087001 (2012).

[12] K. Okazaki, Y. Ota, Y. Kotani, W. Malaeb, Y. Ishida, T. Shimojima, T. Kiss, S. Watanabe, C.-T. Chen, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, K. Hashimoto, T. Shibauchi, Y. Matsuda, H. Ikeda, H. Miyahara, R. Arita, A. Chainani, and S. Shin, Science **337**, 1314 (2012).

[13] S. Kittaka, Y. Aoki, N. Kase, T. Sakakibara, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, K. Deguchi, N. K. Sato, Y. Tsutsumi, and K. Machida, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **83**, 013704 (2014).

[14] R. Thomale, C. Platt, W. Hanke, J. Hu, and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 117001 (2011).

[15] S. Maiti, M. M. Korshunov, T. A. Maier, P. J. Hirschfeld, and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 147002 (2011).

[16] K. Suzuki, H. Usui, and K. Kuroki, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 144514 (2011).

[17] S. Maiti, M. M. Korshunov, and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 014511 (2012).

[18] F. F. Tafti, A. Juneau-Fecteau, M.-È. Delage, S. R. de Cotret, J.-P. Reid, A. F. Wang, X.-G. Luo, X. H. Chen, N. Doiron-Leyraud, and L. Taillefer, Nature Phys. **9**, 349 (2013).

[19] K. Kihou, T. Saito, S. Ishida, M. Nakajima, Y. Tomioka, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, T. Ito, S. Uchida, A. Iyo, C. H. Lee, and H. Eisaki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **79**, 124713 (2010).

[20] K. Murata, K. Yokogawa, H. Yoshino, S. Klotz, P. Munsch, A. Irizawa, M. Nishiyama, K. Iizuka, T. Nanba, T. Okada, Y. Shiraga, and S. Aoyama, Rev. Sci. Instrum. **79**, 085101 (2008).

[21] T. Terashima, M. Tomita, M. Kimata, H. Satsukawa, A. Harada, K. Hazama, S. Uji, H. S. Suzuki, T. Matsumoto, and K. Murata, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **78**, 118001 (2009).

[22] The ratio B_{c2}/T_c would be related to the effective mass in the case of single-band superconductors without the Pauli paramagnetic effect, but its interpretation in multiband superconductors like KFe_2As_2 is not straightforward.

[23] V. Taufour, N. Foroozani, J. Lim, M. A. Tanatar, U. Kaluarachchi, S. K. Kim, Y. Liu, T. A. Lograsso, V. G. Kogan, R. Prozorov, S. L. Budko, J. S. Schilling, and P. C. Canfield, arXiv:1402.7054 (2014).

[24] S. L. Bud'ko, Y. Liu, T. A. Lograsso, and P. C. Canfield, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 224514 (2012).

[25] The critical current density in a superconductor sometimes shows an anomalous peak just below B_{c2}, indicating an enhancement of pinning force acting on vortices. This is called peak effect. Although its origin is not completely understood yet, it is broadly associated with an order-disorder transition of a vortex lattice. See, for example, T. Giamarchi and S. Bhattacharya, arXiv:cond-mat/0111052 (2001).

[26] T. Terashima, N. Kurita, M. Kimata, M. Tomita, S. Tsuchiya, M. Imai, A. Sato, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, H. Kito, H. Eisaki, A. Iyo, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, H. Harima, and S. Uji, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 224512 (2013).

[27] T. Sato, K. Nakayama, Y. Sekiba, P. Richard, Y.-M. Xu, S. Souma, T. Takahashi, G. F. Chen, J. L. Luo, N. L. Wang, and H. Ding, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 047002 (2009).

[28] T. Terashima, M. Kimata, N. Kurita, H. Satsukawa, A. Harada, K. Hazama, M. Imai, A. Sato, K. Kihou, C. H. Lee, H. Kito, H. Eisaki, A. Iyo, T. Saito, H. Fukazawa, Y. Kohori, H. Harima, and S. Uji, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **79**, 053702 (2010).

[29] T. Yoshida, I. Nishi, A. Fujimori, M. Yi, R. G. Moore, D.-H. Lu, Z.-X. Shen, K. Kihou, P. M. Shirage, H. Kito, C. H. Lee, A. Iyo, H. Eisaki, and H. Harima, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **72**, 465 (2011).

[30] D. Shoenberg, *Magnetic oscillations in metals* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984).

[31] S. A. J. Kimber, A. Kreyssig, Y.-Z. Zhang, H. O. Jeschke, R. Valentí, F. Yokaichiya, E. Colombier, J. Yan, T. C. Hansen, T. Chatterji, R. J. McQueeney, P. C. Canfield, A. I. Goldman, and D. N. Argyriou, Nat. Mater. **8**, 471 (2009).

[32] S. Nakamura, T. Moriya, and K. Ueda, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65**, 4026 (1996).

[33] P. Monthoux and G. G. Lonzarich, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 054529 (2001).

[34] See, for example, K. Kuroki and R. Arita, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 024501 (2001).